

ARLINGTON, VA 22201-4714

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/960,652 09/24/2001 2818-58 5995 Claudio De Simone EXAMINER 23117 02/27/2004 7590 NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC AFREMOVA, VERA 1100 N-GLEBE ROAD ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 8TH FLOOR

1651
DATE MAILED: 02/27/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/960,652	DE SIMONE, CLAUDIO
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Vera Afremova	1651
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address		
THE REPLY FILED 04 December 2003 FAILS TO PLAC Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to av final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejection. HE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:		
(a) X they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);		
(b) ⊠ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);		
(c) \(\subseteq \) they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .		
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: none.		
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .	•	
Claim(s) rejected: <u>35-43</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>none</u> .		
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	he Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10. Other:		V. Dhumou
		VERA AFREMOVA PH.D. PATENT EXAMINER

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Continuation of 2. NOTE: new issues are related to the newly inserted limitation such as "enzymatically active extracts" of strain CD2 that require new considerations/searches including possible double patenting issues. The issue of new matter might also exists as directed to the use and/or administration of enzymatically active alkaline spingomyelinase of the strain CD2.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: arguments are not directed solely to the issues raised in the final rejection.